

APPROVED



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
MARCH 18, 2004
MINUTES**

PRESENT: David Ortega, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman
Michael D'Andrea, Design Member
Anne Gale, Design Member
Jeremy Jones, Design Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

ABSENT: James Heitel, Planning Commission Member

STAFF: Jayna Shewak
Kroy Ekblaw
Suzanne Colver
Tim Curtis
Kurt Jones
Keith Niederer
Bill Verschuren
Al Ward

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Ortega at 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

OPENING STATEMENT

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

MINUTES APPROVAL

March 4, 2004 DRB Minutes

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 4, 2004, MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. D'ANDREA.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

20-PP-2003	Boldero Grande Preliminary Plat NEC Hayden Rd & Smokehouse Tr Alignment LVA Urban Design Studio, Architect/Designer
61-DR-1992#3	Macaroni Grill Exterior Modifications Color Change 7245 E. Gold Dust Ave GHA Architect, Applicant
4-DR-2004	Pump Station #42 Perimeter Wall Improvements Wall plan & Elevations 26602 N Pima Rd City of Scottsdale, Applicant
7-DR-2004	8040 E. Indian School Building Remodel/Expansion Site plan & Elevations 8040 E. Indian School Rd Design Coalition, Architect/Designer

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASES 20-PP-2003, 61-DR-1992#3, 4-DR-2004, 7-DR-2004 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.

MR. SCHMITT requested an amendment to the motion to add a stipulation on case 20-PP-2003 that would require that should perimeter walls be proposed in the future for development that they return to the DR Board for approval.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ agreed to that amendment.

APPROVED 4-1-04 - bdf

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ stated case 7-DR-2004 was for the remodel of an existing restaurant to be converted over to office use right on the Indian School and Hayden corner and that cleans up that building quite a bit so they would like to commend them.

MS. SHEWAK requested clarification on the amendment to the motion. She inquired if a perimeter wall does not apply to the individual lots walls but would include if there is a common community wall that would go around the subdivision. Mr. Schmitt stated his concern is if individual property owners were to build walls and there was no continuity. He further stated that he would like to see continuity if there was going to be walls.

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA explained at this point they have a preliminary plat so they do have a second opportunity to review any of the changes in the final plat.

MR. SCHMITT stated when it does come back for final plat there would be another opportunity to look at it and maybe have some development standards that would apply to all of the lots for consistency.

MS. SHEWAK clarified they would stipulate anything along the lines of a joined wall running along the perimeter would come back to the DR Board, which is standard. Mr. Schmitt stated that was his intent.

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA called for the vote.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

1-MP-2004 104th and Bell MEDCP
Master Environmental Design Concept
Plan (MEDCP)
North of Bell Road between 96th St. &
the base of the McDowell Mountains
Toll Brothers, Applicant

MR. CURTIS presented this case as per the project coordination packet. He explained staff amended some of the stipulations based off of the Development Agreement approved on Monday night by City Council. He stated the amendments are mostly reformatted and simplified. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

CHARLES HARE, 7359 E. Wingspan Way, representing the Toll Brothers, stated that they agree with all of the stipulations. He stated they took the Board's suggestions from the study session to heart and hopefully the package before the Board reflects that. He provided a brief walk through of the project. He

reviewed the land use diagram. He reported the density has been reduced by over 30 percent of that which was approved. He provided information on the parks throughout the project. He explained that they have a MEDCP within each of the neighborhoods. He provided information on the trails plan.

MR. D'ANDREA stated the project was impressive. He further stated he was concerned about a few things he saw in the packet. On page 19 regarding the entry area, in some locations it calls for cobble stone pavers and in other areas stone pavers and in another areas it is not quite clear. He inquired if that is a typical detail at the entry. On page 22 regarding the main lighting for the fields at the park. He inquired if they would be lighting the basketball courts or the special events lawn. Regarding the community walls on pages 36, 37, and 38, it states plaster or stucco and then it says stucco or stone, plaster or smooth. He requested clarity on how that would eventually look. On page 39 the ramadas there are four different choices some have a lot of amenities and some are open structures.

MR. HARE stated that in general they put options down so as they get into and fine-tune the design they have the latitude to do what they believe will be the best for the community. He further stated with regard to the ramadas they would probably tend towards the closed solid roof option that would provide greater shade and more opportunities. With Regard to Page 30, there is a typo it should be pilaster or smooth. On page 22 with regard to the lighting, the intent is to light the tennis courts but they did not intend to light the active recreation area for nighttime play.

MR. SCHMITT stated on Page 38 with regard to the wall the conceptual views of home to open space and the wall is depicted as being solid behind the homes (rather) than as pointed out there is a quite generous amount of open space. He inquired about the ability to enjoy that open space if there is a solid wall. Mr. Hare stated that is a very good point noting that was the subject of some discussion and has been addressed in the stipulations and it will be a view fence.

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA stated with regard to the selection of materials from what he sees they are using combinations which are a good thing. He further stated the sign package looks good. He noted at a later point they would have access for school buses.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ requested clarification on some on the amended stipulations noting that on page 2, items 4, 5, and 7 it indicates revised verbiage that indicates to him a little more latitude specifically when it says "shall be considered". Mr. Ekblaw stated this was intended to provide more definition and they were trying to identify a range of things that would be considered part of the submittal application. The important qualifier is that they would have the ability to review and approve that.

Vice Chairman Cortez inquired about the design erosion protection and slope stabilization components specifically the use of concrete slope walls and what material would be used. Mr. Hare stated they are not talking about cast-in-place concrete. They are talking about a material like a Shot-Crete. The reason is for good sound engineering because of the amount of water going through there it would take away any soil. He explained that his area has minimum visibility.

Vice Chairman Cortez stated that he did not think Shot-Crete was a desirable material and would suggest they look at other options. Mr. Hare remarked that they were open to looking at other materials. He explained the reasons why they chose Shot-Crete.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 1-MP-2004 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATION:

THE DEVELOPER CONSIDERS ADDITIONAL OPTIONS WITH REGARD TO EROSION PROTECTION AND SOIL STABILIZATION OTHER THAN SHOT-CRETE.

SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA stated for clarification that would also include the stipulations included in the latest package which are in conformance with the development agreement so those are also included in this motion.

Councilman Ortega called for the vote.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

77-DR-1994#2	McDowell Mountain Ranch Park & Aquatic Center Site plan & elevations SEC Thompson Peak Parkway & McDowell Mountain Ranch Road Weddle Gilmore, Architects, Architect/Designer
--------------	--

MR. KURT JONES presented this case as per the project coordination packet. He stated regarding the amended lighting stipulation staff felt comfortable that the lighting plan could come back for staff review. The other main change in the stipulations deal with the trail and the way the trail stipulation was written. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. JONES stated that he lives about a half a mile away from this project. He explained when this project was introduced there was an amazing amount of material (that) went through the neighborhood that did not have much to do with

APPROVED 4-1-04 - bdf

reality and created a lot of animosity. He further stated that it appears all of the concerns have been worked out. He noted that all the water uses are fenced off so it appears there will be adequate control for what ever the kids would be tempted to do during the school day in that area. He remarked as someone who lives in that area he would like to see it developed because they thought that was part of the deal when they moved in.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ stated this is a very nice project. He stated the reception counter in the main lobby appears to be a partition on either side. He further stated it looks like a great opportunity for a celebration of arrival upon entering that lobby being able to visually move through that entire lobby down those steps onto the outside. He inquired if that was what was happening.

PHILIP WEDDLE, Weddle Gilmore Architects, provided information on the main entry area. He noted they cannot go directly onto the deck from that area because County Code requires entrance onto the deck from the locker rooms. He presented information on the public art element.

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA inquired how children in after school programs would walk over from the school and through the entry to check in. He noted that children always want to take short cuts. Mr. Weddle remarked that they tried to provide as many connections as possible so that they are providing many routes. He reviewed the connections. He reported they tried to develop a strong trail network through the site to encourage pedestrian circulation.

MR. SCHMITT stated this is a very nice project. He further stated that he was disappointed that the Board did not receive any three-dimensional renderings. He requested information regarding their approach to architecture. Mr. Weddle provided a brief overview on the architecture.

Mr. Schmitt inquired if the large glass area on the south elevation was recessed back from the face of the building. Mr. Weddle replied it is recessed back about 20 feet and is fully shaded by the fabric canopy.

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA explained that this center is open to the public and is available for rentals for special events so that was considered in the parking so it can be a community gathering and event center as well.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 77-DR-1994#2 WITH THE REVISED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. JONES.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED 4-1-04 - bdf

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters